

Attorney Docket No. 60072-0808

REMARKS

Claims 1, 13, 15 - 17, 20 - 24, 32 and 36 are amended. Claims 34 and 35 were previously cancelled.

Summary

1. Claims 1-11 and 13-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hawkins (U.S. Patent No. 6,000,000).
2. Claims 12 and 48 - 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hawkins in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,974,238, herein said Chase.

Claim 1

Claim 1, as amended, cites features not suggested much less disclosed by Hawkins. Among these features are:

- (1) storing on an handheld computer two indexes that each index a distinct group of information items to an entity associated with a computer (e.g. a user, user id of handheld computer user, an id of a handheld computer);
- (2) for each index, selecting at least one indexed information item to synchronize with data on a different computer; and
- (3) selecting an information item that is indexed to the two groups to synchronize with different computers.

These features provide important abilities. For data on a computer that must be kept synchronized with multiple sources, the features allow different groups of the data to be kept synchronized with different bodies of data on different computers. Second, it allows the same information item to belong to multiple different groups of information

Attorney Docket No. 60072-0808

items that are synchronized with data on different computers. For example, a manager tracks appointments on a handheld computer using an appointment application. Some of the appointments are work related and some are strictly personal. Records for work related appointments are indexed to a user group of employees. Records for all appointments are indexed to the manager's personal PC. The features of claim 1 allow work related appointment records to be selected for synchronization with data on the handheld computers of employees, and all appointment records, including the work related ones, to be selected for synchronization with the data on the personal PC.

These features are not disclosed or suggested by the cited art. In fact, such features are not possible using the system described in Hawkins. In particular, it is not possible to select to synchronize different groups of information items with different computers using the system taught or suggested by Hawkins. In Hawkins, software on a PC loops through a single synchronization list of conduit libraries, calling each conduit library in an iteration to synchronize a database of an application. (see col. 6, lines 37 – 55, fig. 5, steps 550 – 560) Hawkins does not disclose or suggest the set of entries in the list looped through varies based on the particular handheld computer being synchronized. The databases of the same list of conduit libraries are selected for synchronization any time the system of Hawkins is used to synchronize the handheld computer with the PC.

Based on the foregoing, Hawkins fails to disclose or suggest in any way claim 1, and therefore fails to anticipate or render obvious claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 is patentable. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Attorney Docket No. 60072-0808

Claim 22

Claim 22, as amended, cites features not suggested much less disclosed by Hawkins. Among these features are:

Receiving identification from the first handheld computer, storing data on the second handheld computer that associates first information items with identification of either handheld computers or users, and using the identification and data to identify an information item to synchronize.

As explained earlier, databases of the same list of conduit libraries are selected for synchronization any time the system of Hawkins is used to synchronize the handheld computer with a PC. Hawkins does not suggest in any way that this selection can vary based on an identification of users or handheld computers. Therefore, Hawkins cannot in any way suggest using such an identification to identify information items to synchronize, as claimed.

Based on the foregoing, Hawkins fails to disclose or suggest in any way claim 22, and therefore fails to anticipate or render obvious claim 22. Therefore, claim 22 is patentable. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 22 is respectfully requested.

Claim 36

Claim 36 requires:

Claim 36, as amended, cites features not suggested much less disclosed by Hawkins. Among these features are:

Attorney Docket No. 60072-0808

A conduit that receives identification from the first handheld computer, and uses the identification and data that associates first information items with multiple identifications to identify a subset of information items to synchronize.

For reasons similar to those discussed with respect to claims 1 and 22, Hawkins fails to disclose much less suggest a selection technique for selecting groups of information items to synchronize that selects in a way that depends on an identification, much less an identification received from another computer. Therefore, Hawkins fails to anticipate or render obvious claim 36, and claim 36 is patentable. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 36 is respectfully requested.

Dependant Claims

The pending claims not discussed so far are dependant claims that depend on an independent claim that is discussed above. Because each of the dependant claims include the limitations of claims upon which they depend, the dependant claims are patentable for at least those reasons the claims upon which the dependant claims depend are patentable. Removal of the rejections with respect to the dependant claims and allowance of the dependant claims is respectfully requested. In addition, the dependent claims introduce additional limitations that independently render them patentable. Due to the fundamental difference already identified, a separate discussion of those limitations is not included at this time.


Attorney Docket No. 60072-0808

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are patentable over the art of record. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance is requested by Applicants. Applicants urge the Examiner to telephone Applicants' attorney at (408) 414-1206 if any issues remain that preclude allowance of the application. The Office is given permission to charge any unpaid fees to Applicants' deposit account (50-1302).

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Dated: December 11, 2003

Marcel K. Bingham
Reg. No. 42,327

1600 Willow Street
San Jose, California 95125-5106
Telephone No.: (408) 414-1080
Facsimile No.: (408) 414-1076

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office Fax No. (703) 872-9306

on

10/11/03

by

Trudy Bingham